

### **REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Interview held on June 1, 2005 and for indicating that the proposed amendments to claim 1 appear to overcome the art of record.

Claims 1-20 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 14, and 20 are amended to more precisely recite the features of the claims. No new matter is introduced. Support for the amendments may be found at least at page 12, line 22 to page 13, line 3 and page 13, lines 23-27 of the specification. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims in view of the above amendments and the remarks that follow are respectfully requested.

Entry of the above amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 because the amendments (1) place the claims in better form for appeal if needed; and (2) do not introduce any elements requiring further search by the Examiner.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

On page 2 the Office Action rejects claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) over U.S. Patent 6,785,728 to Schneider et al. (hereafter Schneider). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Schneider is directed to a method and system for distributed administration of access to information. In Schneider's method and system, *a user* of the GUI *selects* a user group. See column 23, lines 42-43. Therefore, as agreed upon during the Interview, Schneider does not disclose or suggest *dynamically* and *programmatically computing* a target node list that contains nodes against which the MSA tool can execute *when a user fails to specify a target node*, using an authorization model that assigns a user the ability to run tools on nodes based on the roles assigned to the user.

In contrast to Schneider, amended claim 1 recites: "if the user fails to specify a target node, dynamically computing the target node list that contains expanded node groups and nodes that the user is able to access based on one or more roles assigned to the user." As noted above, these features are not disclosed or suggested by Schneider. Therefore, claim is allowable.

Claims 2-13 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features they recite.

Regarding claim 14, for the same reason as noted above with respect to claim 1, Schneider does not disclose or suggest "if the user fails to specify a target node, a module for dynamically computing the target node list that contains expanded node groups and nodes that the user is able to access based on one or more roles assigned to the user," as recited in amended claim 14. Accordingly, amended claim 14 is allowable.

Claims 15-19 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 14 and for the additional features they recite.

Regarding claim 20, for the same reason as noted above with respect to claim 1, Schneider does not disclose or suggest "if the user fails to specify a target node, dynamically computing the target node list that contains expanded node groups and nodes that the user is able to access based on one or more roles assigned to the user," as recited in amended claim 204. Accordingly, amended claim 20 is allowable.


Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **June 20, 2005**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kelly T. Lee  
Registration No. 47,743  
**Andrews Kurth LLP**  
1701 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.  
Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20006  
Tel. (202) 662-2736  
Fax (202) 662-2739